commonly by others, a foreigu thing. Whence it must needs be left doubtful, whether he acknowledged any thing incorporeal and immortal at all in us. And the rather because, laying down this principle, that nothing is incorporeal, but what acts independently upon the body, he somewhere plainly determines, that there is no intellection without corporeal phantasms. That, which led Aristotle to all this, positively to affirm the corporeity of sensitive souls, and to stagger so much concerning the incorpo^eity of t^e rational, seema to have been his doctrine of forms and qualities^ whereby corporeal and incorporeal substance are confounded together > so that the limits of each could not be discerned by him. Wherefore we cannot applaud Aristotle for this; but that which we commend him for, is chiefly these four things : first,, for making a perfect incorporeal intellect to be the head of all; and secondly, for resolving, that nature, as an instrument of this intellect, does not merely act according to the necessity of material motions, but for ends and purposes, though unknown to itself; thirdly, for maintaining the naturality of morality ; and lastly, for asserting the TO ty' r]fuv* autexousy, or liberty from necessity.